with a hybrid term, something better than the cumbersome he/she which I frequently see. My occasional use of *she* as well as the usual *he* is not intended as humor, and there is certainly nothing profound about it, but simply my small contribution to what will eventually be common: some way of de-sexing our language. Why should the Bible read "*He* who believes on the son has life"? — *Ed.*)

BOOK NOTES

For 14.95 we'll send you the 2-volume set of *Millennial Harbinger,* which is the best of Campbell's writings in 40 years as an editor. For most purposes it is all one needs to understand the thought of the old sage. Along with it you should read *The Fool of God,* which is a historical novel on Campbell's life, one that you'll have difficulty putting down once you begin reading it. 3.95 postpaid.

We have a new paperback edition of *Do Yourself a Favor: Love Your Wife* at only 2.40 postpaid. There is a reason why 300,000 copies have been sold, for it is transforming troubled homes into vibrant and exciting places. If you think you don't need it, you should read the chapter on "Danger Signals."

Pat and Shirley Boone's *The Honeymoon is Over* is a problem-solving book on marriage and life in general. If one has marital problems, problems with children, with business, with money, this book will be a blessing. It tells of the problems Pat had with the now famous Debby and how they were solved, of their church disfellowshipping them, and of lots of "blowouts" along the way. They continually point to Scriptures that provided answers to their troubled lives. 6.95 postpaid.

For 9.95 we will send you a most readable, colorful, delightful book for children (that adults too will enjoy), *The Child's Story Bible* by Catherine Vos, which has long been a favorite and constantly revised. It even brings archaeology into the stories. Norman Vincent Peale sees it as the best summary of the Bible in story form available anywhere.

If you want to set a Mormon to thinking about his new Bible, then lay on him the evidence presented in *The Mormon Papers.* In no sense vindictive or discourteous, it nonetheless shows key documents to be unauthentic and really brings the Mormon faith to the judgment of the true Scriptures. 3.40 postpaid.

Since folk are living longer and facing lots of problems brought on by old age, Dr. Louis Baer's *Let the Patient Decide* is a much needed volume. He gives you instructions on how to avoid a prolonged illness in a nursing home. Dying is not a tragedy, but becoming a non-person in a nursing home is. He explains that one can decide in advance how he wants to be treated in old age, and he tells you how to deal with doctors and institutions in a forceful manner in this regard. It is a thoughtful, informative book. 5.40 postpaid.

Our bound volume for 1978, *The Ancient Order,* will be mailed out in June to all those who have ordered it or will now order it. We are holding the price at 5.50, which is the same as the 1977 bound volume, *Principles of Unity and Fellowship.* For 5.95 we will send you the double volume for 1975-76, *The Word Abused,* and for 4.95 the double volume for 1971-72, *The Restoration Mind.* These are the only bound volumes still available.

YOUR SUB EXP
WITH THIS IS

WITH THIS ISSUE.

RESTORATION REVIEW

A CALL TO ARMS

Our struggle is against the powers, against the world forces of this darkness, against the spiritual forces of wickedness in the heavenly places. — *Eph. 6:12*

Vol. 21, No. 5 Leroy Garrett, Editor May, 1979

Brethren of the Hills

Blessed are the Peacemakers . . .

PRINCE OF PEACE AND PRINCE OF DEMONS (and the call to arms)

Jesus seemed to realize that he had come into this world to assault the stronghold of Satan. He was destined from eternity to play the chief role in the divine encounter. His constant behavior was that of one who had been called to arms, and he did not mistake either the character or the power of his adversary. He had come to introduce the kingdom of God, but he was aware that this meant war with him who is called the prince of devils. "If it is through the finger of God that I cast out devils," he said to his disciples, "then know that the kingdom of God has overtaken you" (Lk. 11:20).

Satan initiated the conflict in seeking to destroy the people chosen of God to give the Messiah to the world. The Old Testament is the story of that crucible, showing how God time and again frustrated Satan's effort to nip in the bud "the plan of the ages." Once the Messiah was born, Satan made the attack more personal in his attempts to kill him. Then came the temptations in the wilderness, which were real and traumatic, and when these were over "the devil left him, to return at the appointed time." The demonic world had its strategy, and it was not about to leave Jesus alone. Satan would return *at the appointed time.*

We cannot be sure of the meaning of Mt. 11:12, but it may well refer to the demonic effort to maintain control of this world and to thwart the purposes of God's kingdom: "Since John the Baptist came, up to the present time, the kingdom of heaven has suffered violence and the violent are taking it by storm. The "violators" may be the underlings of Satan, who, since the temptation, have been nipping at Jesus' heels at every turn in an effort to neutralize his work.

Satan was as real to Jesus as Rommel, "the dessert fox," was to Gen. Patton. He talked with him as he did any other person, not only during the temptations, but now and again during his ministry. It was only when Jesus rebuked him with a "Be off, Satan" that the old deceiver left him for a time. At the very time that Jesus spoke of giving the kingdom to his disciples, he spoke directly to the beloved fisherman

Address all mail to: 1201 Windsor Drive, Denton, Tx. 76201

RESTORATION REVIEW is published monthly, except July and August, at 1201 Windsor Drive, Denton, Texas. Entered as second class mail, Denton, Tx. SUBSCRIPTION RATES: $4.00 a year, or two years for $7.00; in clubs of five or more (mailed by us to separate addresses) $2.00 per name per year. (USPS 044450)

with these terse words: "Simon, Simon! Satan, you must know, has got his wish to sift you all like wheat" (Lk. 21:31). The Greek verb suggests that Satan "demanded" to put Peter and the other apostles to the test, somewhat as he had in the case of Job. He had to get permission to subject God's faithful to such a brutal ordeal as he brought upon the apostles. While Jesus allowed Satan to do his thing, he assured Peter that he was praying for him.

Jesus used the metaphor "sift like wheat," not Satan, for Jesus knew that as wheat has to be sifted so the apostles had to be tested. To Satan the apostles were not like wheat to be sifted but as straw to be burned. His intention was not to test but to destroy. It is evident that Satan had his strategy, which included encounters with Jesus himself wherein he would make his demands in the ongoing struggle. *I want Peter!,* he demands of Jesus. The Messiah allows it, but not without soliciting help from the Father, praying for Peter to be strong. And he speaks to Peter in the tenderest of terms and calling him by his more intimate name, and imploringly, *Simon, Simon!* They were at war with the powers of this world.

In the combat with Satan the Master realized that his adversary sometimes was present and speaking through those closest to him. When he was predicting his death in Jerusalem and Peter sought to dissuade him, Jesus addresses not Peter but his adversary: "Get behind me, Satan!" But Satan at this time must have been a *fallen* adversary, but one who would not give up. When the Seventy returned to Jesus, joyful that the demons were subject to them, Jesus explained why this was: "I watched Satan fall like lightning from heaven" (Lk. 10:18). We cannot be sure when this was, but it may have been when Satan was defeated by the Son of God in the wilderness. Even he, the exalted prince of demons, could not cause the Christ to sin. So he fell from his lofty, presumptuous position that he had exalted to heaven itself. Jesus, witnessing the defeat, likened the sudden fall to a flash of lightning. He certainly is not saying that he saw Satan fall out of heaven. He is saying that he witnessed his defeat, at his own hands.

But like a caged animal that is still alive and dangerous, Satan is at work, and he has designs upon all the faithful just as he did upon the Messiah and his disciples. The war goes on. It began in a special way when evil forces arrested Jesus in Gethsemane. "This is your hour; this is the reign of darkness," he said to them (Lk. 22:53), as if to grant that Satan was having his moment of victory. The Prince of Peace would be murdered by the Prince of Demons. The Son of God himself would die like any other man and be buried in the earth. It was surely the darkest day in all of human history. Jesus was dead and Satan was victorious.

But the Prince of Peace was also the Lord of Glory (1 Cor. 2:8) and there was no way for deity to remain in the grave. God raised him up to sit at his own right hand, and when Paul addressed pagans in Athens he argued that the resurrection was proof enough that Jesus was the appropriate one to judge all men (Acts 17:31). And in Col. 2:15 he contends that Jesus' death and resurrection "got rid of the Sovreignties and the Powers, and paraded them in public, behind him in his triumphal procession." It is a beautiful metaphor. The shameful tree became the victor's triumphal chariot, before which his enemies are driven in ignominious defeat.

The Jews believed that the angels had brought the Law down out of heaven, "ministered by angels" as Gal. 3:19 puts it. The demons, who were among the sovreignties and powers, were honored as lawgivers and thus worshipped, as Col. 2:18 indicates. Since the people were obligated to the Law to keep it, there was that "record of the debt" that they could not pay, which loomed before them as a mountain of bankruptcy. It is this, the debt the people owed because of the Law and not the Law itself, that Jesus nailed to the cross. It was like parading the enemy in public when he lost his legalistic control over the people. Grace not only triumphed over the legalism of the Law, but over all legalism of all law.

The soul and heart of man is thus the battleground. This is shown in Jesus' concern for those possessed of evil spirits. Such spirits were aware of his presence and fearfully acknowledged his deity when he approached them: "They (two demoniacs) stood there shouting, 'What do you want with us, Son of God? Have you come to torture us before the time?'" (Mt. 8:29). How did they know who he was? They belonged to the spirit world and thus had supernatural insight and/or they had been with him in heaven, before their own fall, and knew very well who the Lord of Glory was. They made the soul of man their place of battle and this sealed their doom. Had they chosen to possess beasts Jesus would not have been so concerned, and on one occasion, at the demons own request, lest they have *nothing* to possess, he drove them into swine. It is where demons should be, if anywhere!

The Prince of Peace has thus gained the victory over the Prince of Demons. If God is thus on our side, who can be against us?, the apostle asks in Rom 8:31. Not even Satan. "For I am certain of this: neither death nor life, no angel, no prince, nothing that exists, nothing still to come, not any power, or height or depth, nor any created thing, can ever come between us and the love of God made visible in Christ Jesus our Lord."

Those words are shot through with references to the spirit world. Paul was aware of the warfare and realized that he had been summoned

to the conflict. He was certain that while the victory was not yet complete there was no power, in this world or in the spirit world, that could separate him from God's love. Since Jesus stands at God's right hand, pleading for us, we have the victory in spite of all that Satan might do. It is the magnificent assurance.

The Prince of Peace is thus our peace because of his victory over the Prince of Demons. But the victory is not complete until the last day when the soul of man can no longer be the battleground and when Satan is forever destroyed. In the meantime we are at war. We are called to arms. The weapons of our warfare are not carnal and the fight we fight is the fight of faith. We are summoned to wage peace.

But it is no less a war, and we are called to be soldiers, duly equipped with the sword of the Spirit, the shield of faith, and the breastplate of righteousness. Only with these can we put out the burning arrows of the evil one.

If indeed we are at war with "the spiritual army of evil in the heavens" (Eph. 6:12), then we must have a strategy and a plan of assault. If we are conquerors for him, then we must storm the strongholds of Satan that are all about us. It is important to remember that the enemy is doing his evil work in our homes, churches, and schools, as well as those places where we expect to find him. — *the Editor.*

IS "THE BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT" SCRIPTURAL?

My answer to this question is both *Yes* and *No,* depending on what one means by the baptism of the Holy Spirit. I propose to treat this subject in reference to two common notions.

1. The baptism of the Holy Spirit is or was indeed real, but it was given only to the apostles in Acts 2 and the Gentiles in Acts 10, which were miraculous manifestations. Since its purpose has been realized, there is no longer any such thing. Some would also include Paul, the Samaritans in Acts 8, and the disciples in Acts 19 as recipients of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. But it is argued that once the apostles died and all those on whom they had laid their hands had died, there was no longer any way for Holy Spirit baptism to be given.

2. The baptism of the Holy Spirit continues to be given to believers today, albeit not necessarily all believers. This view holds that one may become a Christian and receive "the gift of the Holy Spirit" (Acts 2:38) and may sometime afterwards receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

Especially among "charismatics" Holy Spirit baptism is urged upon people who have long since been baptized into Christ. Thus "receiving the Baptism" is the apex of the Christian life, and it may or may not be accompanied by speaking in tongues.

In this essay I am questioning both of these positions. The first one is an unsupportable deduction. That the baptism of the Holy Spirit, however defined, was given only in certain cases and then abruptly shut off to future generations hardly satisfies what the Scriptures say on this subject. My own explanation of the meaning of Holy Spirit baptism, which follows, will further show why I think this position is unacceptable.

I believe the second position is wrong in that it assumes as true that which the Scriptures do not teach: *that once one is baptized into Christ and becomes a Christian she is yet to be baptized again, of the Holy Spirit, to receive the fullness of God's blessings.*

It is ironic that the idea of "baptism of the Holy Spirit" should be so paramount in some people's thinking when it occurs so seldom in Scripture. While the term does appear five times, they all refer to the same incident, John's report that while he baptized with water Jesus would baptize with the Holy Spirit (and with fire, in some accounts). If there were eight writers of the New Testament, five of them do not once use the term, and the three who do are referring to what John said. In all the letters to the churches, where problems aplenty are dealt with, there is not one instance of believers being told that they should receive Holy Spirit baptism. While it is a constant theme in many a pulpit today, and is made by many the *sine qua non* of the Christian faith, it holds no such place in Scripture. The Holy Spirit, of course, does hold such a place, but not the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

Even in the letters to the seven churches, where the Lord himself is dealing with weighty problems, there is no such reference. To one church, deeply in trouble, he stands at the door and knocks, offering to come into their hearts if they will only open up. He promises to sit with them in the most intimate fellowship. All this without the slightest reference to Holy Spirit baptism, which is usually the frame of reference in some circles for those seeking such renewal. One would think that if Paul would eagerly implore his readers to be filled with the Spirit, to be aglow with the Spirit, and not to quench the Spirit, he would somewhere speak of what is commonly referred to these days as "the Baptism." The Scriptures use no such language.

But there is the reference to Jesus baptizing in the Spirit, and we should seek its meaning. That it could not refer to an actual or real baptism is evident from the fact that baptism is not only an *immersion* but also an *emersion.* In water baptism one not only goes *into* the water

but also *out of* the water. The word always has this force in Scripture. Even in the washing (baptism) of pots and pans in Mark 7:4 the articles come *out of* as well as *into.* So if there were a literal baptism in the Spirit, it would suggest that one exits the Spirit as well as enters the Spirit, and that would hardly do. An *actual* Holy Spirit baptism would hardly make sense, so we conclude that Jesus was using a metaphor when he said "I baptize you in the Holy Spirit," which meant *I will give you the Holy Spirit.*

There are several such metaphors of the Spirit that cannot be taken literally. I Cor. 12:13 refers to drinking of the Spirit and Eph. 5:18 speaks of being filled with the Spirit. No one believes that he can actually drink the Spirit or be filled with it as his lungs would be filled with air. They are metaphors that stand for receiving or possessing the Spirit. When Acts 2:4 says "It filled all the house where they were sitting," the reference is to the wind or what appeared to be wind, but it is really another metaphor, pointing to the Spirit overflowing the room and those in it, which is a dramatic way of showing that they all received the Holy Spirit, which is what Jesus promised when he said, "John baptized with water but you, not many days from now, will be baptized with the Holy Spirit" (Acts 1:5).

In Acts 11:15-16 Peter refers back to what happened on Pentecost, comparing it to what happened to the Gentiles in the home of Cornelius. He says, "the Holy Spirit *fell on them,* as on us at the beginning," referring to Acts 2. This caused Peter to remember the Lord's promise of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. So *fell on* and *baptized* mean the same thing. They were "baptized in the Spirit" when "The Holy Spirit fell on them." Then he says "God gave them the same gift he gave unto us." It follows that the *falling* of the Spirit, the *baptism* of the Spirit, and the *giving* (or receiving) of the Spirit all refer to the same thing.

There is reason to conclude that Peter is referring back to the promise of the gift of the Holy Spirit as found in Acts 2:38-39, for in Acts 11:17 he says God gave *them* (the Gentiles) the like gift (the Spirit) that he gave *us* (referring to those listening to him, which included those who obeyed Acts 2:38 on that day, as well as the apostles who received the gift in Acts 2:4). The condition he laid down for receiving the Spirit was the same for the Gentiles (Acts 10) and the Jews (Acts 2) — *faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.* The apostles (or was it 120 people?) did not receive the Spirit in Acts 2:4 simply because they were apostles, but because they *believed.* The Gentiles did not receive the Spirit simply to prove they were as acceptable as Jews, but because they believed.

I therefore conclude that all believers receive the Holy Spirit as a gift, which is what Acts 2:38 promises, and this means the same as the baptism of the Holy Spirit, which is a metaphor referring to that promise. It is God's birthday gift to each of his children.

So what am I saying? *Is* Holy Spirit baptism scriptural? *Yes,* if one understands it to be the symbol that it is, just as "the Holy Spirit is come upon you" in Acts 1:8 is a symbol. They both, like *drinking, being filled, fell upon,* are metaphorical references to the great promise of the Messiah, that he would give the Holy Spirit to those that believe on him.

But the answer is *No,* Holy Spirit baptism is not in the Scriptures if one means something different from "the promised Holy Spirit" of Eph. 1:13 and "the gift of the Holy Spirit" in Acts 2:38. When one believes, repents, and is baptized in the name of Christ, as Acts 2:38 teaches, he or she receives forgiveness of sins *and* the gift of the Holy Spirit. There is no promise anywhere in Scripture of *another* baptism called the baptism of the Holy Spirit, for Acts 2:38 is the fulfillment of the promise of Jesus, I will baptize you in the Holy Spirit, which metaphorically is simply saying, *I will give you the Holy Spirit.* Since Pentecost he has made good on that promise, giving the Spirit to *everyone* who is baptized into Christ.

If you have difficulty seeing "I baptize you with the Holy Spirit" as a metaphor, it will help to remember that Jesus adds "and with fire," which completes the metaphor. Contrary to popular understanding, fire here does not likely refer to hell or judgment, but, as in the prophets, to the refiner's fire or the fire of purification. In the Bible baptism is never used of punishment. Jesus is referring to the power and consecration that comes through the indwelling Spirit. Luther caught the sense of the baptizing fire when he sung: "And each believing soul inspire with thine own pure and holy fire." This is the baptism of fire promised to every believer, such as Paul's "Be aglow (aflame) with the Spirit."

This view of Holy Spirit baptism recognizes that the Spirit deals with us in different ways once he dwells within us as the promised gift. He surely empowered the apostles uniquely. He gave some in Corinth the gift of tongues and the power to perform miracles. There are diversity of gifts but the same Spirit. He gives all of us some gift, and so we are all charismatic or gifted by the Spirit.

This interpretation harmonizes passages that otherwise may slip by us. Again and again the New Testament makes it clear that the Spirit is given to us ***when we believe.*** It is "because you are sons" that the Galatians received the Spirit, or, as Paul put it, "Did you receive the Spirit by the works of the law or by the hearing of faith?" Rom. 8:9 shows clearly that we are not Christians if we do not have the Spirit. Acts 5:32 says God gives the Spirit to those who obey him, and 1 Jn. 3:24 shows that this precious gift is within every Christian heart, assuring us: "We know that he lives in us by the Spirit that he has given us."

It is confusing when believers are told there is yet a "baptism of the Holy Spirit" that they are to seek. When we see that this term is a metaphor referring to the very gift the Christian already has, it frees him to appropriate more fully what God has given. Paul suggests in Eph. 5:17 that one should even be controlled by (or made drunk on) this precious indwelling gift. John assures us that this gift teaches us, comforts us, and even anoints us.

When folk tell me, therefore, that they have received the baptism of the Holy Spirit, perhaps after years of *seeking,* as they sometimes put it, I can only conclude that they have now discovered that wellspring of joy and power that has been at their disposal all along. It is the same thing as finally inviting Jesus to make his home with us when he has been standing at the door all along. Just as Jesus can be at the very door of our hearts and we not realize what change may be wrought when he is invited in, we can have the Holy Guest of heaven within us and not realize the resource of power that is ours. One can live a life of poverty while the beneficiary of a great fortune *and not know it.*

Those who are in Christ Jesus need not suffer such a tragedy, for the peace and joy of the Holy Spirit, which makes us rich, is for each of us. *—the Editor*

Pilgrimage of Joy . . .No. 35

WHAT HAPPENS WHEN YOU CHANGE

W. Carl Ketcherside

I have often been asked about the effect of my changing convictions upon the party of which I had been one of the leaders. That, of course, is always the crux of any change. In the Saint Louis area where brethren could question me personally and where they could observe the life of Nell and myself, all of us continued to grow together in love. It was not quite so tranquil in other parts of the country. As I began to expose my changing views there was first astonishment and then resentment.

I had been a leader in opposition to the "Rough Draft" as presented by Chester and Allen Sommer in Indianapolis, Indiana. I had worked with their brother, D. Austen Sommer, in salvaging a "faithful

church." Later when problems arose with the latter I had again been a leader in what we called "preserving the faith." Now I was saying the faith revealed in the Book was greater than, and not even related to our petty problems. Indeed, I was beginning to intimate that it was not only supremely above the Sommer movement, but the whole Campbell movement. The body of Christ as viewed by God was infinitely superior to all of our hassels and wrangles about means, methods and machinery. I suggested that He might not have been with us in any of our debates and controversies.

At first the opposition was an undercurrent. I would hear rumors of speeches delivered in various places opposing my concept of fellowship. Occasionally someone would write me that his congregation had received a warning against me. I was no longer sound in the faith. It was suggested that I might be losing my mind and that much learning had made me mad. I was not invited to speak at a few gatherings where I had once been welcomed. As the spirit of opposition gradually began to crystallize and to surface in order to protect itself, it became centered in three men among the older brethren — E. M. Zerr, Roy Loney and C. R. Turner.

Brother Loney was a good writer but was completely deaf. His speaking was greatly affected by his condition, and he was very difficult to understand. He had been alienated from his family and isolated from the brethren for some years because of his involvement in local church troubles. I went to Colorado and offered him an opportunity to write for Mission Messenger. He readily accepted. However, he had grown up in an age of preacher rivalry and church trouble, and was happiest when engaged in a running feud by mail. My changing views presented him another opportunity. He wrote letters to brethren whom he deemed weak in Saint Louis and sought to woo them into allowing him to come and start a "faithful church" and gather the dissidents together. They brought the letters to me and we ignored them.

Brother Turner's influence was limited and hurt by his own judgment. Possessed of an inflexible spirit, and being radical by nature, he felt called upon to try and drive brethren to see things as he did. Wherever he went he assailed "the new doctrine on fellowship." He was especially embittered by my emphasis on love as the solution of all of our problems and ridiculed it publicly whenever he could.

Brother Zerr was possessed of the greatest knowledge of the Book of any man among us. Every year, after his wife died, Nell and I had him come and stay with us for at least two weeks at Christmas time. He liked our children and enjoyed the spirit of gaiety which they created when they came home. I had edited and published his large book *New Testament Questions* and had also brought out the six volume commentary which he wrote. We were close to each other and I arranged for him to speak in congregations in the Saint Louis area.

He was a columnist for our little journal, writing a monthly article, "Word Studies in the Bible." He was adept at this kind of thing and had his articles in on time every month. As I began to air my developing views he became uncomfortable at appearing in the same paper with me. More and more it was apparent in his column that he was attempting to shore up our traditional partisan position. This was evident in his column for March 1958 when he wrote on the words "Heresy and Faction." The same issue carried two articles of mine. One was titled "The Party Spirit." Some have said it was the most keenly analytical article I have ever written. The other article was another installment of "Thoughts on Fellowship."

It was this series which Brother Zerr could not allow to go unchallenged. He wrote me that he would not continue to write for the paper unless he was permitted to write about my fallacies. I replied that I would welcome anything he said which would point out my error, and nothing he wrote would keep me from loving him. Accordingly, he announced his intention of dealing with my views in the August issue of 1958 in an article entitled "Preface." The intensity of his feeling was shown by his concluding words, "I am not vain enough to think I can 'stem the tide' of this disastrous movement. But I know that I can clear my conscience by raising my voice and hand against another incipient gash in the body of Christ."

In an editorial note I said, "We cherish the right for Brother Zerr to differ with our views, and we will provide him the same opportunity to be heard as we ask for ourselves. He may set forth any view he holds in this paper. . . The fact that our brother, or any other brother, disagrees with us will make no difference in our treatment of him. We will demonstrate one time in history that there is room in the fellowship of God for brethren to differ in love."

It was obvious that I now faced the first real test of my view that love was the ultimate dynamic which could maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. For the first time I was committed to a wholly new approach to dealing with those who differed with me. I examined my own heart and found out that I was not shamming it. I loved these brethren in spite of their human weaknesses and mine. I resolved not to hurt their influence nor put a stumblingblock in their way. I would simply be true to Jesus. I would correct any mistakes which they sustained by evidence and apologize for any wrong.

I published all that Brother Zerr wrote. I replied as gently as possible. The result was that brethren had both sides of the

controversial thinking before them in the same issue of the paper. I felt deeply that the things I was writing would some day be generally accepted. I was content to plant and water. I would "learn to labor and to wait," and allow time, the great arbiter, to validate what I was saying. As for the present I must be true to increasing knowledge regardless of consequences.

We escaped without a formal split, for which I have ever been thankful. It is true that some brethren with whom I had labored branded me a Benedict Arnold. Of course they knew little about what I was seeking to do and nothing about Benedict Arnold. In private letters I have since seen, I was referred to as a traitor. None of these things moved me nor did I count my life dear unto myself. I knew the brethren did not realize the scope of what I was saying and they were angry, thinking I had left them. Actually I did not leave anyone. My only sin was the receiving of all of God's children as my brothers. I did not consider that loving others more meant that I loved those with whom I had been associated any less. I moved out of the stagnant pool of backwater into the mainstream of God's mercy and love.

In these days I am constantly running into good brothers and sisters whom I knew in the olden days. They would have nothing to do with me then. But many of them have now become less sure that they have a perfect understanding of all truth. They have seen their children and grandchildren drift away from the cold, calculating legalism which we then equated with the will of God. It has shaken them. They have mellowed and become more open. Some of them are now members of groups about which they condemned me when I suggested there might be Christians among them.

I have learned one thing which has proven valuable for me. When problems arise, if one can avoid saying too much about them in their initial stages he will not have so much to retract later on. Human pride often interferes with our acknowledgment of wrong and congregations which choose sides actually create the "sides" by their choosing. All matters are better when handled with cool heads and warm hearts than with hotheads and cold hearts.

On Labor Day weekend in 1958 occurred a meeting of great significance. It was held in the little city of Nowata, Oklahoma, and was arranged by my brother Paul who presided over it. Hundreds of brethren gathered from several states. It was a rich time in sharing. Featured was a discussion of instrumental music in relation to fellowship. Participants were Seth Wilson, Don DeWelt, Leroy Garrett and myself. The format proved to be excellent. There were three sessions of two hours each.

In the first each speaker took thirty minutes to state his personal convictions on the theme without regard to the others. I had not consulted with Brother Garrett as to what he might say. In the second session the four speakers questioned each other seeking for clarification of the views expressed. In the third session all sat together upon the platform and fielded questions from the audience. The method was far superior to a debating routine. One of the chief blessings accruing from it was involvement of the audience in the questioning. I came to love and respect Seth Wilson and Don DeWelt as sincere brethren in the Lord. That feeling has deepened with the passing years.

On October 27, I suffered a great loss when my uncle, L. E. Ketcherside, was suddenly called home to be with the Lord. He had spent the day before mimeographing 450 sheets for door-to-door distribution in Bismarck, Missouri. It was a work he loved. He covered one short street when death stabbed at his heart, and he fell backward, with the remainder of the tracts fluttering to earth about his prostrate form. He never writhed or twisted. Death was instantaneous. He was the last of my father's brothers and sisters. As I spoke before his casketed form I realized that his death closed one chapter of a family history which had provided four gospel preachers.

In December Brother Garrett launched *Restoration Review.* He was assisted by Brother Clint Evans of Hartford, Illinois, as publisher. From the outset the journal met a real need. Many of the articles were classics. It has continued until this day doing untold good in a fearless presentation of vital matters.

Not everything was good. The opposition against my thinking became more intensified. In some instances there was bitterness toward me. Brother Loney wrote in our September issue: "Little pipsqueaks carried away with a smattering of 'new' scholarship show a disposition to solve all the problems of the universe. If the teaching on fellowship that is now being offered is to prevail, then this brotherhood will disintegrate, and become a thing of the past." Our brother did not realize that we were praying for all "brotherhoods" to disintegrate and those who composed them to merge into the one body of Christ.

We will soon be mailing our bound volume for 1978, entitled *The Ancient Order.* The price is 5.50, only 1.50 beyond the price of a subscription, and it is handsomely bound with dust jacket and table of contents and matches previous volumes. You need send no money, for an invoice will be enclosed. If you have already ordered the book, that is sufficient.

If you believe in what we are trying to do, you can help out by sending the paper to five people for a year for only 10.00, and that can include your own name as a renewal.

ONE STEP ENOUGH

Robert Meyers

I once heard a speaker deliberately misquote Mark 2:9, reading it this way: "Stand, take up your bed, and *talk.*" Since the misquoter was himself busy talking, I presumed that he did not rule out that exercise entirely as a useful human endeavor. But he was stressing the idea that the most important thing a Christian can do is *walk,* not *talk.*

Talking is so easy that the men who do it with some facility are always in deadly peril. "My brothers, not many of you should become teachers, for you may be certain that we who teach shall ourselves be judged with greater strictness." (James 3:1).

The problem is that people who talk a great deal often convince themselves that they have *done* a great deal. They confuse the energy it takes to talk with the quite different energy of doing. They think great deeds verbalized are great deeds accomplished.

The paralysis is contagious. It is also easy for those who listen to believe that the future's dream has already been realized, simply because the words that describe it have erupted into air. So strong are these convictions that it is frequently hard to get people to act after they have heard words endlessly.

But what Jesus really said was, "Take up your bed, and *walk.*" Put one foot before the other, take one step at a time, and discover the joy of getting someplace! We cannot play Giant Stride very often; it is essentially a children's game. But we can faithfully put one step ahead of the other until, lo and behold! we have gotten somewhere.

I am made to remember Cardinal Newman's famous hymn, *Lead, Kindly Light.* It was composed when he was becalmed in a fog on a boat bound from Sicily to Marseilles. Newman was on his way back to England after a visit to Rome. Religiously, he was terribly vexed and torn by conflicting emotions. In this lyric, he sought and found peace of mind.

One part of it has been especially meaningful to me. Newman prays that God will keep his feet, then says humbly: "I do not ask to see the distant scene — one step enough for me." *One step enough for me.* No sweeping vision requested, no vast panorama of all that God intends, but only the step just ahead of one.

Grant us wisdom, O God, to place one foot ahead of the other to do the simple tasks that lie right under our eyes, and to avoid the distractions caused when we try vainly to look further into the future than we can possibly see. Amen.

BE A SHERLOCK HOLMES WITH THE SCRIPTURES

I am not suggesting that you should approach the Bible with the cold deductive logic of a shrewd detective, but I am saying that there are things that a Sherlock Holmes can teach us about examining the Scriptures.

Conan Doyle, the creator of Sherlock Holmes, fashioned his legendary detective after a real live person, a physician friend of his named Joseph Bell. Dr. Bell diagnosed the ills of his patients not unlike the meticulous method used in the many episodes of Sherlock Holmes, and he trained his student doctors as if they were destined to be detectives. "A cobbler, I see," he would say to his students, as he scrutinized a patient, pointing to a worn spot inside the knee of the man's trousers, where he had rested a lapstone, an instrument used only by cobblers.

The story that Doyle liked to tell on his old doctor friend included this conversation with one of his patients:

"Well, my man, you've served in the army?" "Aye, sir."
"Not long discharged?" "No, sir."
"A Highland regiment?" "Aye, sir."
"Non-com officer?" "Aye, sir."
"Stationed at Barbados?" "Aye, sir."

The doctor explained to his students that the man was courteous but did not remove his hat, which is the practice in the army, and he had not been a civilian long enough to change his habit. He had an air of authority and was obviously Scottish. Since he complained of elephantiasis, which is West Indian and not British, he deduced that he had been in Barbados.

Dr. Bell explained to Doyle that the secret of good disgnosis is "the precise and intelligent recognition and appreciation of minor differences." The doctor stressed that his students should *use* their eyes and ears and memory, which is good advise to Bible students as well. He also spoke of "an imagination capable of evolving a theory" and of "piecing together a broken chain or unravelling a tangled clue."

Recognize and appreciate minor differences may be made a rule for Biblical interpretation, which is different from nitpicking. If the Holy Spirit makes distinctions, they must be important. The smallest detail may be crucial to our understanding. A woman of royalty who accepted the faith, for instance, explained that she could be a believer because 1Cor. 1:26 says, "not many mighty, not many noble, are called." She was thankful that it reads not *many* rather than not *any*!!

Paul begins Rom. 12 with a *therefore,* which is really not all that big a word (only three letters in Greek), but whenever a *therefore* appears in Scripture it is well to find out what it is there for. For eleven

chapters he instructs us in rather deep theology, and then says *therefore,* which would surely catch the eye of Dr. Bell and Sherlock Holmes. The apostle unloads all that heavy stuff, and then says, *Therefore this is how you ought to live.* So he put a lot of punch behind such instruction as not being conformed to this world and loving without dissimulation.

The little adverb *as* makes *therefore* look gargantuan, but it is nonetheless weighty in Scripture. Take Rom. 15:7: "Wherefore receive ye one another, as Christ also received us to the glory of God." School kids learn that *as* is an adverb of manner. In *this manner* (the way in which Christ received us) we are to receive one another. If Jesus did not receive me until I was free of all error and all my hangups and prejudices, then it is all right for us to receive others in that manner. But if he received me while I was yet weak and wrong, then I am to receive my sisters and brothers who are weak and wrong.

The *wherefore* (another three letter word in Greek) in that verse is another one of those minor differences that we are to appreciate, and it is to be distinguished from *therefore.* It means something like "on account of which," or the cause or reason for something. Rom. 15:7 therefore reaches back to all Paul has said in the previous chapter on how believers can disagree and still be of one heart. "On account of these principles" or "for these reasons" you are to receive one another *as* Christ received you. That passage is filled with golden nuggets that will make us rich in unity and fellowship.

That little *as* also speaks to us in Rom. 6:19: "As ye have yielded your members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity; even so now yield your members servants to righteousness unto holiness." The *as* really lays it on us. As we served sin back in the world we are now to serve righteousness. In Eph. 5:28 the little word appears again, showing a man he is to love his wife *as* he loves his own body.

Say what we will for Conan Doyle's friend Dr. Bell, he was hardly a match for the fabulous Sherlock Holmes. There was hardly anyone who could *observe* like Sherlock, and this is a prime rule for effective Bible study as well as detective work. Sherlock was always saying to his sidekick, Dr. Watson, "Elementary, Watson, elementary!," once he had unraveled a knotty mystery. What *now* appears to us as simple we were once blind to. It was there all the time, but we needed help in seeing it. Or maybe we just needed to *observe* more closely. This is why we must remain patient with those who do not see what we now see. It is not so elementary after all, not to them at least, just as it wasn't to Dr. Watson.

Once when Dr. Watson was asking Sherlock about his method of operation, the detective explained that it was a matter of observation,

and he proceeded to tell Watson that he had been to the post office that morning and the purpose was to send a telegram. Watson was amazed and wanted an explanation as to how he knew. "It is simplicity itself," Sherlock insisted, pointing to a little reddish mould on Watson's instep which he picked up entering the post office, the red clay being there due to construction work near the post office. But the telegram? Well, people go to a British post office only for three reasons, to post a letter, buy stamps, or send a telegram. He knew Watson had not written a letter since he had been with him and he knew he had sheets of stamps in his desk.

But Sherlock Holmes has had his competitors for top sleuthhound, fictional or otherwise. One was Zadig, a hero in Voltaire's tale by that name. One day Zadig was walking in the woods when he was approached by officers and asked if he had seen the king's prize horse that had broken free. Zadig asked if it were a horse with a faultless gallop, five feet high, small hoofs, a tail three and a half feet long, the studs of his bit made of fine 23 carat gold, its feet shod with silver shoes eleven pennyweights. Yes, of course, that was the royal horse, said the officers, and they wanted to know where he was.

When Zadig said he had not seen him nor heard anyone speak of him, he was arrested for stealing the king's horse and imprisoned. Afterwards when the horse was found, the embarrassed judge withdrew the charge but fined Zadig for lying in court. But he was allowed to plead his cause. He told what he had observed as he walked along the road in the woods. The marks of a horse's shoes were all of equal distance, so he knew that horse had a faultless gallop. The dust upon the trees, where the road was but seven feet wide, was here and there rubbed off on both sides, three and half feet from the middle of the road. The whisking of the tail rubbed off the dust, so he knew the tail was that long.

Where the trees along the road formed a canopy five feet above the ground, leaves had fallen to the ground, so he concluded the horse had brushed them and was therefore five feet tall. The horse had rubbed its studs against a touchstone, the properties of which he ascertained to be 23 carat gold, and by the marks his shoes made upon other stones Zadig concluded that they were silver of eleven pennyweights. Elementary!!

If we were that observant with the Bible, we would surely come up with all sorts of goodies that we are now missing. Sir Isaac Newton was a scientist, but like Zadig and Sherlock Holmes he discovered a great deal by *carefully applying his mind to it,* as he himself revealed his secret of discovery. We can all relate instances of a "find" in Scripture that we wonder why we were so long in seeing. Our famed Negro

evangelist of yesteryear, Marshall Keeble, likened that experience to finding "poke chops" in the hog, which were there all along.

For many years I did not "see" the word *manner* in 1 Jo. 3:1, even though I knew the verse by heart. It has new meaning to me now that I see the apostle is not simply talking about the love that God has bestowed upon us, but the *kind* or *degree* of that love — "what *manner* of love the father has bestowed upon us." I've known for a long time that 1 Jn. 6:10 does not make money the root of all evil, but the *love* of money, though a lot of people still haven't observed the difference. Only recently, however, in reading through Mark did I realize that Jesus' own mother, as well as his other relatives, actually thought that he had gone crazy (Mk. 3:21, 31). I just hadn't looked at the road like old Zadig did.

To be a Sherlock Holmes with the Bible we must first of all be honest. The famous sleuth never approached a "whodunit" with his mind made up. We must *want* the truth and our purpose must never be to justify what we already believe. Our mind-set is to be a hunger for righteousness, for only then do we truly learn. Alexander Campbell called this "coming within an understanding distance." Once this is our attitude it will transform our approach to the Bible and our lives as well. — *the Editor*

OUR CHANGING WORLD

Prof. Hans Kueng of Tuebingen University in Germany in his *Signposts for the Future* issues twenty theses on what it means to be a Christian. The first thesis asserts that that person alone is a Christian who lives the whole of life in the light of Jesus Christ. This is similar to Thomas Campbell's thesis in the *Declaration and Address,* which asserts that the Christian is one who professes faith in Christ and who obeys him in all things according to the Scriptures and who manifest the same by his temper and conduct. Too often our view has been far more superficial than that of Kueng and Campbell.

In a workshop on elders at Harding College, Prof. Jack Lewis of Harding Graduate School presented a study of the relevant Greek terms. He concluded that the terms indicate that the elder is more of a servant than an authoritative figure — "an example to be followed, a teacher from whom to learn, a shepherd whose voice one hears, a protector from the wolves, a leader to whom one submits in humility because he is God's steward, and he is an older man to whom respect is gladly given." At the same conference Reuel Lemmons, editor of *Firm Foundation,* pointed to leadership rather than rulership in reference to elders. It was also observed that the eldership should not be self-perpetuating.

Harold Thomas, 8427 Bleriot St., Los Angeles 90045, will send you a brochure on the tours he conducts to Europe and the Holy Land. If you plan that trip of a lifetime anytime soon, here is your chance to go with exciting company.

Tim Timmons recently addressed Dallas Seminary on "friendship evangelism," urging the students to go out in the marketplace where the people are. We are only talking to ourselves, he noted. Rather than handing out cliches, we must touch people at the point of their needs.

There is more than one thing special about the College Park Christian Church in Normal, Illinois, which is now in its new facility. It was formed in 1971 when a Church of Christ and a Christian Church merged, reversing the trend of division. Their new building is located on land once owned by Alexander Campbell. A copy of his will is attached to their deed. How's that for something special?

READERS EXCHANGE

Love you so much. I was writing checks for renewals — *Eternity* 10.00, *Moody Monthly* 10.00, and I think your paper is worth that much to me also. Just moved into a new home. Praise the Lord! — *Mac LeDoux, Weatherford, TX*

(If everyone did this, I'd put Ouida on a salary! But we really do not want this and we are determined to keep our sub rate at 4.00, inflation or no. You can see that Mac is prospering. That is a story of trust and hard work. Having spent years training Vietnamese to fly helicopters in this country and eventually going to Vietnam as a missionary, he finally came upon difficult times. His bank financed his first copter and he began hiring out for joy rides all over this part of Texas, including Denton and Ouida and me, except I think ours was for free. His company has continued to grow and they now offer all sorts of copter services. And now a new home. Should you hear him tell about his life in Vietnam, you too would *Praise the Lord. - Ed.*)

At age 83 I have earnestly contended for two decades that the sins of the fathers over "methods and things" need not be visited upon our children through the third and fourth generation and beyond. This is providing that we are moved by the Holy Spirit to show proper honor and respect for the prayer which Jesus poured out to the Father that His disciples be one, as he knelt almost in the shadow of his own cross. — *Stewart Hanson, Sr., Long Beach, CA*

I feel the Holy Spirit is calling all Christians to be as one, also, to break away our stiff-necked differences and let Jesus Christ fill us up with Himself so that brotherhood and love will unite all believers — *Brenda Hawbaker, Decatur, IL*

For years I was a staunch believer in the doctrine of the Church of Christ until some eleven years ago when God began showing my wife and me the truth, Jesus Christ, and slowly led us out of the religion which had us in bondage into a new relationship with Him and His son, as well as the Holy Spirit. The Lord has led us back into the Church of Christ but now with the understanding of what it is to be in the Church of Christ . . . I have found that in having to give up many brothers in Christ that I have gained so many more, and now I am slowly and joyfully gaining the former ones back. My prayer is that we will never go back under law. — *Denton Gillen, Garden Grove, CA*

I have a question. You have started using the feminine for the generic personal references, such as "If one works hard, *she* can get a lot done." What's the idea? Is it humor or are you saying something profound that escapes me. Why not answer this in your paper since there must be others who wonder about this? — *Rod Cameron, Converse, IN*

(Prof. Bruce Metzger of Princeton set me to thinking on this gender thing when he told me that the committee of the Revised Standard Version, of which he is a member, was to meet to see what could be done about the continual use of the masculine gender in that version of the Bible. Eventually linguists may come up